

RF 9/19/05 290.74503N

PATENT

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested. Claims 24-28, 30-40 were rejected under Section 102
5 as being anticipated by Kessenich. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant's understanding of the Examiner's interpretation (page 3 of the Office action) of Kessenich is that Kessenich's "keywords" are the connector words such as "the",
10 "and" etc. listed in col. 4, lines 15-23 of the Kessenich patent. The Examiner also asserts that Kessenich discloses search means for identifying the command list associated with the keyword since col. 8, lines 20-25 discloses an exclusion command using user assigned keywords. The conclusion that Kessenich's web
15 browser anticipates the features of the present invention is respectfully traversed by the applicant. For example, Kessenish does not use those excluded keywords in the selection means as required by the amended claim 24.

Kessenich merely discloses an exclusion list of
20 keywords (or common connector words) that are to be ignored by the database builder when building the database file 108 (col. 4, lines 16-23, col. 8, lines 9-23). In this way, the database can be made smaller since it does not include unnecessary words.

RF 9/19/05 290.745U8N

PATENT

Applicant strongly submits that neither Kessenich nor any other cited reference teaches or suggests selection means for selecting a first processing unit based on the first keyword (which is the same first keyword that are distinguished from the requested information by the detection means) and a second processing unit based on the second keyword.

If, as suggested by the Examiner, the first keyword is equivalent to Kessenich's common connector words in col. 4, then those connector words are never used again for selecting which database server process should be used. In the alternative, if the first keyword is equivalent to Kessenich's "abort" search word as shown in Fig. 4, then this word is not distinguished by detection means from the requested information as required by the amended claim 24. Kessenich's search, filled in by the user in the query box 416, only contains the keyword that is to be search for and no other information. Also, the "abort" keyword is not used to select which processor should process the request. The keyword is merely used by the same database processor regardless which keyword is entered into the query box 416 by the user.

Kessenich and the other cited references completely fail to teach or suggest the selection means required by the amended claim 24. More particularly, it is submitted that Kessenich fails to teach or suggest a routing module that has selection means for selecting a first information processing unit

RF 9/19/05 290.74508N

PATENT

based on a first keyword and selecting a second information processing unit based on a second keyword and wherein the second information processing unit is different from the first information processing unit. Kessenich merely provides a list of keywords that are to be ignored since they appear so often (col. 4, 18-20). None of the ignored keywords in Kessenich are used for selecting a first processing module based on the first keyword and a second processing module based on the second keyword all for selecting processing modules, as required by the amended claim 24. Kessenich is using the same processor regardless of what the ignored keywords are. Kessenich is merely teaching that certain keywords or connector words should be ignored.

The Examiner refers to col. 14, lines 20-26 to show that Kessenich is teaching a routing module that has selection means for selecting a first processing unit based on the first keyword and a second processing unit based on the second keyword. Applicant disagrees. Element 1008 merely transforms the search results to hypertext links, as shown in Fig. 10. In other words, the keywords in the search results are tokenized when the search result is on its way back to the user after the search has been carried out by the database processing unit. Element 1008 does not select the first database processing unit based on the first keyword (which were included in the exclusion list and therefore

RF 9/19/05 290.745USN

PATENT

ignored anyway) and directing means for directing the message to the first processing unit based on the first keyword so that the first processing unit carries out the commands associated with the first keyword, as required by the amended claim 24. Element 5 1008 merely transforms the tokenized symbols to hyperlinks and element 1010 transmits the results back to the web browser. Again, element 1008 does not use the first keyword (as distinguished by the detection means) to select and direct the message to the first processing unit.

10 It is submitted that Kessenich and the other cited references fail to teach or suggest means for selecting and directing the converted message to the first information processing module based on the first keyword and to the second information processing module based on the second keyword. As 15 indicated above, Kessenich is teaching away from these features since he is teaching that the keywords should be ignored. Kessenich completely fails to teach means for directing and selecting the information processing modules based on the keywords.

20 Applicant fails to see how a keyword that is ignored can be used for selecting an information processing unit. This means that the keyword is not ignored which is contrary to the teaching of Kessenich.

RF 9/19/05 290.745UBN

PATENT

Applicant fails to see why a person of ordinary skill in the art would look to Kessenich and the other cited references to learn about a router module that has means for directing and selecting a first processing module based on the first keyword
5 and for selecting a second processing module based on the second keyword when such selection means is completely missing from the cited references. Also, the applicant fails to see why a person of ordinary skill in the art would use the keywords for further processing when Kessenich teaches that the keywords should be
10 ignored.

In view of the above, the amended claim 24 is submitted to be allowable.

Claims 25-28 are submitted to be allowable because they depend, either directly or indirectly, on the amended allowable
15 base claim 24 and because each claim includes limitations that are not taught or suggested in the cited references.

Claim 29 was rejected under Section 103 as being obvious over Gardner in view of "Official Notice." This rejection is respectfully traversed.

20 Claim 29 is submitted to be allowable because it depends on the amended allowable base claim 24 and the claim includes limitations that are not taught or suggested in the cited references.

RE 9/19/05 290.745USN

PATENT

The amended claim 30 is submitted to be allowable for reasons that are similar to the reasons put forth for the allowability of the amended claim 24. Kessenich and the other cited references fail to teach or suggest the step of detecting
5 and distinguishing the first keyword from the requested information in the first message. The cited references also fail to teach the step of selecting the first information processing unit based on the first keyword and selecting the second information processing unit based on the second keyword,
10 searching in the first information processing unit for the first command list associated with the first keyword and in the second information processing unit for the second command list.

It is submitted that Kessenich and the other cited references completely fail to teach to the step of distinguishing
15 the key word from the requested information and then using this keyword for selecting the processing unit that is to carry out the commands in the command list associated with the keyword. As shown in Fig. 4, Kessenich is merely asking the user to enter a keyword to be searched for in a query box. There is absolutely
20 no teaching or suggestion of distinguishing the first key word from the requested information and then using this first keyword to select the first processing unit. In the alternative, even if Kessenich is teaching the use of an exclusion list that contains keywords, those excluded keywords are never used for selecting

RF 9/19/05 290.745USN

PATENT

the processing module. Additionally, Kessenich and the other cited references completely fails, among other things, to teach or suggest the steps of selecting the first processing unit based on the first keyword and selecting the second processing unit
5 based on the second keyword.

There is no reason for a person of ordinary skill in the art to look at Kessenich and the other cited references to learn about the features listed above when those features are completely missing from the cited references.

10 The amended claim 30 is therefore submitted to be allowable.

Claims 31-40 are submitted to be allowable because they depend, either directly or indirectly, on the amended allowable base claim 30 and because each claim includes limitations that
15 are not taught or suggested in the cited references.


RF 9/19/05 290.745USN

PATENT

In view of the above, the application is submitted to
be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully
requested.

Respectfully submitted,

FASTH LAW OFFICES



Rolf Fasth
Registration No. 36,999

FASTH LAW OFFICES
26 Pinecrest Plaza, Suite 2
Southern Pines, NC 28387-4301

Telephone: (910) 687-0001
Facsimile: (910) 295-2152